UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/610,493	06/30/2003	Robert K. Hughes JR.	MS1-1444US	5381

22801 7590 07/08/2008

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
ZHAO, DAQUAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2621	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/610,493	HUGHES, ROBERT K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAQUAN ZHAO	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *25 and 29-32* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24,26-28 and 33-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. **For claim 1**, applicant argues Kanda fails to teach a method comprising: identifying multimedia elements having a linear time-code number; adding a prefix value to linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element; and adding suffix value to the linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element. The examiner disagrees.

3. Kanda teach a method comprising: identifying multimedia elements having a linear time-code number (e.g. figure 3B of the instant application is what applicant intended to claim. figure 8 of Kanda has the similar data structure for the video (program) data, wherein the “IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA” and the "OUT-POINT TIME-CODE DATA" are both linear time code; figure 3, column 10, lines27-41 describes a clip of video is identified by user by marking the video frame and the time code has the value of “00:00:00:00” which is believed to be in the “HH:MM:SS:FF” format); adding a prefix value to linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element (e.g. figure 8 shows the title comes before the “IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA”, and this "title" is considered to be the "prefix value"); and adding suffix value to the linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element (e.g. the “SYMBOL TIME-CODE DATA” is considered to be the suffix value).

4. **For claim 33**, applicant argues Kanda fail to teach a multimedia device comprising: a process ; a multimedia storage module executable on the processor and configured to store multimedia presentation content comprising of multimedia elements; and an extended time-code number module executable on the processor configured to append extended time-code numbers to multimedia element without a time-code number. The examiner disagrees.

5. Kanda teaches a multimedia device comprising: a process (e.g column 26, lines 38-63, CPU 303); a multimedia storage module executable on the processor and configured to store multimedia presentation content comprising of multimedia elements (e.g. hard-disk drive 300 stores video under the control of CPU 303); and an extended time-code number module executable on the processor configured to append extended time-code numbers to multimedia element without a time-code number (e.g. time-code generating unit 313 generates time code for the video frame and the time code is allocated to the video frame by the CPU 303).

6. **For claim 13**, applicant argues Kanda fails to teach identifying a title value describing a particular multimedia presentation content comprised of multimedia elements described by extended time-code numbers; The examiner disagrees.

7. **Kanda** teaches identifying a title value describing a particular multimedia presentation content comprised of multimedia elements described by extended time-code numbers (e.g. figures 3 and 8 clearly show the data contents has a "TITLE" and contains in point and out point associated with the time code).

8. **For claim 17,** applicant argues Kanda fails to teach the searching is performed based on a time map table that associates multimedia elements with extended time-code number. The examiner disagrees.

9. **Kanda** teaches the searching is performed based on a time map table that associates multimedia elements with extended time-code number (e.g. column 26, lines 45-62, when the CPU 303 reproduces or plays back the video, the CPU 303 has to know when to look for the video data. column 26, lines 45-62 teaches the CPU 303 search for the video data according to the relation of the time code and the recording address, wherein the time code are stored in a table).

10. For claim 14, applicant argues Kanda fails to teach the extended time-code numbers comprise a prefix and suffixes. The examiner disagrees.

11. The original specification defined the prefix value as a title value and the suffix value as language, angle and parental block value. See claims 3, 4 and figure 3B of the instant application. In light of the specification, the examiner interpret the prefix value as the "TITLE" in figure 8 of Kanda because the "TITLE" comes before the “IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA”, and the examiner considers Items comes after the "IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA" in figure 8 of Kanda as the suffix such as "INDEX NO. OF IN-POINT CLIPPED IMAGE DATA", "SYMBLO TYPE", "SYMBOL TIME-CODE DATA"...etc.

12. For claims 4 and 16, as discussed in claim 14 above, Kanda fails to teach the language value, angle value, and parental block value. Sturgeon et al teach the language value, angle value, and parental block value (e.g. column 7, lines 1-27, and

figure 5). It would have bee obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add language value, angle value, and parental block value to figure 8 of Kanda as the suffix to increase the effectiveness of parental management of content presentation (Sturgeon et al, column 4, lines 1-15).

13. **For clam 15**, Kanda fails to teach searching is performed based on the prefix and on one or more of the suffixes. Sullivan teaches searching is performed based on the prefix and on one or more of the suffixes (e.g. claim 25 of page 14). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sullivan into the teaching of Kanda for high speed searching.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanda (US 6,324,335 B1).

In regards to claim 1, Kanda teach a method comprising: identifying multimedia elements having a linear time-code number (e.g. figure 3B of the instant application is what applicant intended to claim. figure 8 of Kanda has the similar data structure for the video (program) data, wherein the “IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA” and the "OUT-POINT TIME-CODE DATA" are both linear time code; figure 3, column 10, lines27-41 describes a clip of video is identified by user by marking the video frame and the time code has the value of “00:00:00:00” which is believed to be in the “HH:MM:SS:FF” format); adding a prefix value to linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element (e.g. figure 8 shows the title comes before the “IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA”, and this "title" is considered to be the "prefix value"); and adding suffix value to the linear time-code numbers of each identified multimedia element (e.g. the “SYMBOL TIME-CODE DATA” is considered to be the suffix value).

In regards to claim 33, Kanda teaches a multimedia device comprising: a process (e.g column 26, lines 38-63, CPU 303); a multimedia storage module executable on the processor and configured to store multimedia presentation content comprising of multimedia elements (e.g. hard-disk drive 300 stores video under the control of CPU 303); and an extended time-code number module executable on the processor configured to append extended time-code numbers to multimedia element without a time-code number (e.g. time-code generating unit 313 generates time code for the video frame and the time code is allocated to the video frame by the CPU 303).

In regards to claim 9, Kanda teaches a broadcast point that performs the method of claim 1 (e.g. column 4, lines 6-14 and column 1, lines 4-8);

For claim 26, Kanda teaches a broadcast point that performs the method of claim 23 (e.g. column 4, lines 6-14 and column 1, lines 4-8);

In regards to claim 11, Kanda teaches identifying elements without a linear time-code number, and adding a linear time-code to the identified elements without a linear time-code (e.g. column 28, lines 6-15).

In regard to claim 3, Kanda teaches the prefix value comprises a title value (e.g. column 18, line 66- column 19, line 22, and figure 8, Title, which is arrange before the in-point time-code data, corresponds to the prefix value, wherein the title value has 16 bytes);

For claim 10, Kanda teaches a multimedia device that performs the method of claim 1 (e.g. figure 1, column 4, lines 6-14).

In regards to claim 13, **Kanda** teaches identifying a title value describing a particular multimedia presentation content comprised of multimedia elements described by extended time-code numbers (e.g. figures 3 and 8 clearly shows the data contents has a "TITLE" and contains in point and out point associated with the time code).

In regards to claim 17, **Kanda** teaches the searching is performed based on a time map table that associates multimedia elements with extended time-code number (e.g. column 26, lines 45-62, when the CPU 303 reproduces or plays back the video,

the CPU 303 has to know when to look for the video data. column 26, lines 45-62 teaches the CPU 303 search for the video data according to the relation of the time code and the recording address, wherein the time code are stored in a table).

For claim 14, Kanda teaches the extended time-code numbers comprise a prefix and suffixes (The original specification defined the prefix value as a title value and the suffix value as language, angle and parental block value. See claims 3, 4 and figure 3B of the instant application. In light of the specification, the examiner interpret the prefix value as the "TITLE" in figure 8 of Kanda because the "TITLE" comes before the “IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA”, and the examiner considers Items comes after the "IN-POINT TIME-CODE DATA" in figure 8 of Kanda as the suffix such as "INDEX NO. OF IN-POINT CLIPPED IMAGE DATA", "SYMBLO TYPE", "SYMBOL TIME-CODE DATA"...etc.).

Regarding claim 23, Kanda teaches a multimedia device that performs the method of claim 13 (e.g. figure 1).

Regarding claim 24, Kanda teaches a multimedia player that performs the method of claim 13 (e.g. figure 1).

Regarding claim 27, Kanda teaches a multimedia device that performs the method of claim 23 (e.g. figure 1).

Regarding claim 28, Kanda teaches a multimedia player that performs the method of claim 23 (e.g. figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda (US 6,324,335 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33 above, and further in view of Sturgeon et al (US 6,429,879 B1).

See the teaching of Kanda above.

For claims 4 and 16, Kanda fails to teach the suffix values comprise language value, angle value, and parental block value. Sturgeon et al teach the suffix values comprise language value, angle value, and parental block value (e.g. column 7, lines 1-27 and figure 5). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Sturgeon et al into the teaching of Kanda to increase effectiveness of parental management of content presentation (Sturgeon et al, column 4, lines 1-15).

18. Claims 2, 12, 34, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda (US 6,324,335 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33 above, and further in view of the Prior Art section of the instant application.

See the teaching of Kanda above.

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Kanda fail to teach the multimedia elements comprise audio video elements and interspersed elements. The Prior Art section of the instant application teaches the multimedia elements comprise audio video elements and interspersed elements (e.g. figure 2 and page 6, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the Prior Art section of the instant application into the teaching of Kanda to effectively management information from different sources.

Regarding claim 34, Kanda teaches a multimedia player module executable on the processor and configured to play the audio/video element (e.g. figure 1).

Regarding claim 35, Kanda teaches the multimedia player is configured to search for audio/video element based on extended time-code numbers (e.g. column 36, lines 45-62).

Regarding claim 36, Kanda teaches a multimedia player (e.g. figure 1).

19. Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda (US 6,324,335 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33 above.

See the teaching of Kanda above.

In regards to claim 5, Kanda teaches linear time-code numbers with prefix and suffix values are resident in a table that associates the multimedia elements to linear time-code numbers (e.g. figure 8). However, Kanda fails to specify the table of figure 8

is a time map table. Kanda also teach a time map table in column 26, lines 39-44. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Kanda to also stored the prefix and suffix values of the linear time-code number in the time map table for the same reasons as taught in column 32, lines 39-49 of Kanda, which is to specify reproduction speed for the specified event to use system resources efficiently since figure 8 of Kanda is used to specify an event of the video data (see column 17, lines 4-17).

Regarding claim 7, Kanda teach provides pointers to data structures in a medium (e.g. column 19, lines 22-27).

20. Claims 6, 8,18, 19, 20, 21,22, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda (US 6,324,335 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33 above, and further in view of Saeki et al (US 6,078,727).

See the teaching of Kanda above.

For claim 6, Kanda fails to specify the time map is used by a DVD player to point to particular sectors on a DVD disc containing content representing the multimedia elements. Saeki et al teach the time map is used by a DVD player to point to particular sectors on a DVD disc containing content representing the multimedia elements (e.g. figures 8-9, column 9, lines 26-56). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Saeki et al into

the teaching of Kanda to reduce the amount of optical disc reproduction information for storage efficiency (Saeki et al, column 2, lines 30-35).

For claims 8, 18 and 37, Saeki et al teach a DVD player that implements the method of claim 7, and wherein the medium is a DVD disc (e.g. figure 14).

For claims 19 and 38, Saeki et al teach the multimedia device is a personal video recorder (e.g. figure 14).

For claim 20, Saeki et al teach the time map table is part of an information file that provides navigation and presentation information for titles in a medium (e.g. figure 8, the time map table is in the AV File management table, which is in the AV data management file, which is used for navigation and presentation).

For claim 21, Saeki et al teach a DVD player that implements the method of claim 20, and wherein the medium is a DVD disc (e.g. figure 14).

For claim 22, Saeki et al teach the multimedia device is a personal video recorder (e.g. figure 14).

21. Claim15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda (US 6,324,335 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33 above, and further in view of Sullivan (US 2004/0,030,665 A1).

See the teaching of Kanda above.

For clam 15, Kanda fails to teach searching is performed based on the prefix and on one or more of the suffixes. Sullivan teaches searching is performed based on the prefix and on one or more of the suffixes (e.g. claim 25 of page 14). It would have

been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sullivan into the teaching of Kanda for high speed searching.

There's no new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEG § 706.07 (a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing data of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing data of this action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period. Then the shortened statutory period will expire on the data the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing data of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the data of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daquan Zhao whose telephone number is (571) 270-1119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 -5, alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai Q, can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Daquan Zhao/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621
Daquan Zhao

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621